

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 7 to include a variation of unique features of claims 12 and 13.

Accordingly, Applicant cancels claims 12 and 13. In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claim 17 which is clearly supported throughout the specification.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0161915 A1 to Crow et al. (hereinafter “Crow”) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0069973 A1 to Ganesan et al. (hereinafter “Ganesan”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0037302 A1 to Varma et al. (hereinafter “Varma”) and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0095512 A1 to Rana et al. (hereinafter “Rana”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: “wherein the other received fragment packets are stored in a fragment buffer, wherein a list is stored in the fragment look-up table for each of fragmented packets, wherein, if the received fragment packet is determined to be the first fragment packet, searching the look-up table for a first list that corresponds to the other received fragment packets, wherein the other received fragment packets together with the first fragment packet form a datagram, and wherein if the received fragment packet is determined to be the first fragment packet and the first list is found in the look-up table, editing the list to update the index to be valid and searching the fragment buffer for the other received fragment packets and

transmitting the found other received fragments based on the updated valid index of the first list without assembling the fragment packets to form the datagram.”

Crow, Ganesan, Varma, and Rana do not disclose or suggest editing the list to update the index from invalid to valid when the received packet is determined to be the first packet. On the contrary, the session ID in Rana is not changed from invalid to valid when first packet is received. For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-6 and 14-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Independent claim 7 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, arguments presented with respect to claim 1 apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous exemplary reasons, therefore, independent claim 7 is patentable over Crow, Ganesan, Varma, and Rana. Claims 8-11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 7.

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claim 17 which is patentable by virtue of its dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. **If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below to set up an Interview.**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/786,326

Attorney Docket No.: Q78241

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 5, 2008